



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

TRANSACTIONS  
OF THE  
AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
1922

---

I. — *The Poems of the Appendix Vergiliana*

BY PROFESSOR H. RUSHTON FAIRCLOUGH

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

THE whole question of the authenticity of the poems of the Appendix Vergiliana would provide material for an interesting chapter in the history of literary criticism. The poems were not included by Virgil's literary executors, L. Varius and Plotius Tucca, in their edition of the poet's work, and are not found in any of the major Virgilian codices. There is no allusion to them in the *vita* prefixed to the commentary of Valerius Probus of the first century, but in that which preceded the commentary of the fourth-century Donatus — generally supposed to be borrowed largely from the second-century Suetonius — we have an enumeration of the *Catalepton*, *Priapea*, *Epigrammata*, *Dirae*, *Ciris*, and *Culex* as early works of Virgil. The sentence containing this list is somewhat uncertain, for two fifteenth-century manuscripts omit the *Catalepton* and *Ciris*, and insert the *Moretum*. Nettleship therefore suspects that the original statement referred only to the *Culex*, of which the writer gives a brief account, though he has nothing to say about the other poems. He does add, however, "scripsit etiam de qua ambigitur Aetna," thus showing that he knew of the existence of an *Aetna*, which some at least of his contemporaries must have attributed to Virgil.

The *Vita* given by the Virgilian commentator Servius, also of the fourth century, contains the important statement: "scripsit etiam septem sive octo libros hos: Cirin, Aetnam, Culicem, Priapea, Catalepton, Epigrammata, Cōpam, Diras," in which the *Copa* is added to the earlier list.

Poems corresponding to those enumerated in these two ancient lists have survived in a number of late manuscripts, none of which probably are earlier than the tenth century. In some of these the poems are included in a collection entitled *Virgilii iuvenalis ludi libellus*, and embracing the poems known as *Est et non*, *De viro bono*, *De rosis nascentibus*. These are thought to be of the fourth century. Two elegies on Maecenas, which also bear Virgil's name, are doubtless much earlier in origin.

In the light of nineteenth-century criticism all of these poems were pronounced non-Virgilian, and Gudeman voices the general verdict of the age when he says that "their spuriousness is established by incontrovertible proofs" (cited by Rand). With the twentieth century the pendulum has swung in the other direction. In 1901 Skutsch reopened a discussion of the problem, when in his *Aus Vergils Frühzeit* he argued that the *Ciris* belonged to Virgil's own age. Skutsch however did not claim for the poem Virgilian authorship. He was convinced that the *Ciris* was the work of Virgil's friend, Cornelius Gallus, from whom by way of compliment the greater poet later borrowed many verses. Even as late as 1911 Mackail could say of the *Ciris* together with the *Dirae* and *Lydia*: "No one in modern times has seriously argued that they are by Virgil himself" (*Lectures on Poetry*, p. 55).

Following in the footsteps of Skutsch, a goodly number of scholars have turned their attention to these Minor Poems, and many have expressed the conviction that one or some or all of those commonly included in the Appendix are actually Virgil's own work. Thus Drachmann, *Herm.* XLIII (1908), accepts the *Ciris* as Virgil's; Birt in his *Jugendverse und Heimatpoesie* (1910) advocates the Virgilian authorship of

most of the poems of the *Catalepton*, though he is also most emphatic in rejecting the *Culex*. The latter, however, has been accepted as genuine by a group of English scholars, e.g., Phillimore, *Class. Phil.* 1910, Miss Jackson, *Class. Quart.* 1911, Butcher, *ib.* 1914, and W. Warde Fowler, *Class. Rev.* 1914. Vollmer, in his revision of Baehrens' *Poetae Latini Minores* (1910), frankly states that he sees no good reason for rejecting any of the poems of the Appendix, and this conclusion has been accepted in America by Professor E. K. Rand, whose extremely able article on "Young Virgil's Poetry" appeared in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, xxx (1919).

Rand accepts the *Culex* as a youthful effort of Virgil's, "written under the spell of Lucretius." The *Catalepton* "attests a vigorously Catullan period in Virgil's career." Birt's view that the *Priapea* were written not long before the *Bucolics* is accepted, while the "fourteen" pieces of *Epigrammata* are partly early and partly late. The early ones are very Catullan and some show the youthful Virgil among the poets of love. No. ix, however, in praise of Messalla, "a distinctly mediocre affair, such as great poets sometimes produce when writing from a sense of duty," was written either after Actium in 31 B.C. or in honor of Messalla's triumph over the Aquitanians in 27 B.C., that is to say, when Virgil was either just finishing the *Georgics* or beginning the *Aeneid*. If the poem is really by Virgil, this is undoubtedly the conclusion we must accept, however startling, and therefore it is not surprising to find that even Birt, wedded as he is to the Virgilian authorship of the *Catalepton* as a whole, flatly rejects the poem on Messalla, as also does Sommer (1910), who shows that there is a close connection between it and the *Panegyric on Messalla* included in the Tibullan Corpus (iv, 1).

Anyone who can accept No. ix as Virgilian will have little difficulty in recognizing Virgil as the author of even No. xiii, along with which may be grouped vi, x, and xii. These, says Rand, may have been "prompted by the *Epodes*," and indeed Némethy is so impressed by the Archilochian character of

xiii that he assigns it definitely to Horace's authorship. Rand, however, would "credit Virgil with starting in Roman literature a form which Horace claimed as his creation" (p. 140). Birt, curiously enough, accepts xiii for Virgil and supposes that it preceded v, in which the invitation to the Camenae to return to the poet, *sed pudenter et raro*, involves a confession of shame at the composition of xiii. This would make v rather late in Virgil's career, though the usual view, as represented by Nettleship, would assign the poem to Virgil's sixteenth year, when he was first taking up the study of philosophy.

The vow made to Venus in xiv must also, if Virgilian, be late in the author's career, and Rand looks favorably upon Birt's view that its composition may be placed between *Aen.* i and *Aen.* v, at a time when it would have been very unusual for pentameters to close, as do three of these six, in polysyllables. No. viii, addressed to Siro's villa, must be contemporaneous with some of the *Eclogues*, being written after either the battle of Mutina in 43 B.C. or that of Philippi in 41 B.C. The elegiac epitaph, xiii A, in praise of some Roman scholar who rivalled the writers of Athens, is of course not by Virgil, though Vollmer thinks Virgil is the subject of eulogy. In like manner, the epilogue, No. xv, is evidently by the editor, who assures us that the collection of *elementa*, or first efforts, to which it is appended, is by the divine poet who was sweeter than Theocritus, greater than Hesiod, and not inferior to Homer. Birt thinks that this editor was L. Varius, and that, as the verses refer only to the *Catalepton*, they imply that Virgil's literary executors did not ascribe to him the other minor poems which others attributed to him. This of course is a dubious inference, but I see no reason for supposing with Rand that the collection to which the verses are appended should contain some epic element and therefore that poems like the *Culex* and the *Ciris* must have been included. The writer was probably some uncritical person, who did not realize that some poems of the *Catalepton* could not possibly be called

*elementa*, at least as far as Virgil was concerned. He must therefore have been somebody quite different from Varius or Tucca, and Sommer seeks to prove from the ἄπαξ λεγόμενον *Homereus* and the peculiar use of *elementa* that the epilogue is distinctly post-Augustan.

As to the vexed question of the date of the *Ciris*, the probability surely is that, if it is by Virgil, it is an early work, dedicated to the young Messalla. Who can believe with Vollmer that it was issued by Virgil as late as 27 B.C., the year of Messalla's victory over the Aquitanians, when Virgil was in his forty-fourth year? Yet hardly more credible is the view advocated by Rand, that the *Ciris* comes between the *Bucolics* and the *Georgics*, that is, when Virgil was at least thirty-four years old. If a study of the parallels leads to such a dating, then a second inference should be that the poem is not by Virgil, but by some poet strongly under Virgil's influence.

Inasmuch as even Donatus expressed doubt as to the Virgilian authorship of the *Aetna*, for he says "de qua ambigitur," it is indeed "a daring act of heresy" for Rand to claim this work for the greatest of Roman poets. For my part I fear that such a view is quite untenable, even though I am to show presently that so far as vocabulary is concerned, the *Aetna* does not depart from Virgilian usage appreciably more than the *Culex*. Rand indeed would place the *Aetna* between the death of Lucretius and the writing of the *Bucolics*. "Being a writer of individuality," he says, "Virgil uses expressions that he does not elsewhere use, just as in the second Georgic we find some rather striking cases not found in his other works or in Lucretius." Since most critics regard the *Aetna* as a product of Silver Latin, this is indeed a remarkably bold verdict.

The *Copa* too, we are assured, shows features that are "characteristic of Virgil," but as the *Moretum* is all realism, and moreover is "not in the ancient list," Rand does not claim it for our poet. The *Dirae*, however, is "altogether in Virgil's manner," and is practically contemporaneous with the *Bucolics*, but the *Lydia* is not by the same hand as the *Dirae*.

Rand's bold plea for a recognition of the Virgilian authorship of these Minor Poems has been followed in a still more audacious manner by Professor Tenney Frank, who in this very year, 1922, has brought out a new life of Virgil,<sup>1</sup> which is frankly based on the assumption that most of the poems we are discussing are Virgil's own product, composed in his formative years, and therefore "full of personal reminiscences. They reveal many important facts about his daily life, his occupations, his ambitions, and his ideals, and best of all they disclose the processes by which the poet during an apprenticeship of ten years developed the mature art of the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*. They have made it possible for us to visualize him with a vividness that is granted us in the case of no other Latin poet" (Frank, p. vi). If we can learn all this from these poems, they become material of extraordinary importance, but before we can utilize them for such a purpose, we must convince ourselves, as Frank has convinced himself, that the poems are indeed the genuine work of Virgil.

Frank is just as ready as Rand to accept the Virgilian authorship of *Catalepton*, XIII, thus assigning to the poet, who was *vita et ore et animo tam probus ut Neapoli Parthenias vulgo appellatus sit*, the verses which, if Birt's exegesis is correct, are probably the foulest and filthiest effusion of the Latin Muse now extant. The eulogy on Messalla (IX), according to Frank, was written in 42 B.C., on receipt in Italy of news of the first battle of Philippi, when the camp of Octavius was captured. We are of course more ready to suppose that these insipid verses were written at an early, than at a late date in a writer's career, but even so Frank holds that some of the *Eclogues* antedate this poem.<sup>2</sup> However, the assumption that Virgil could ever have written laudatory verses on such an occasion will need more proof than is here produced before it can be accepted.

<sup>1</sup> *Vergil, a Biography*: Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1922.

<sup>2</sup> Radford regards IX as "the earliest extant work of Ovid, written in his seventeenth year" ("The Juvenile Works of Ovid," *T.A.P.A.* LI, 159

The Donatus *vita* states that the *Culex* was written by Virgil when only sixteen (xvi) years old, but Frank, assuming that there is an error in the numeral, assigns the poem to Virgil's twenty-first (xxi) year. The *Ciris* belongs, he thinks, to the same time, though the dedication was not written until several years later. The *Aetna* may be "the first fruit of Virgil's studies in evolutionary science at Naples" (p. 58), but Frank is not as sure as is Rand of the Virgilian authorship, being haunted by "that stray phrase *de qua ambigitur*" (p. 60). He admits the "hopelessly prosaic ugliness" of the theme, the "scholastic method" and "acerbity" of the author, and decides that "the poem is not a happy experiment." The credentials offered on behalf of Virgilian authorship are certainly not very satisfactory.

The poem known as the *Dirae* was written by Virgil, thinks Frank, at the same time as the first Eclogue, that is, in 41 B.C. It resembles that Eclogue in its "bitterness," but not in "its grace and tactful beginning." The *Lydia* is to be rejected as the effort of "a neurotic and sentimental pupil of Propertius" (p. 131, n. 18). The *Moretum* has no manuscript evidence to support its claim to Virgilian authorship, but Frank holds that it was composed in Virgil's day, and would not be disinclined to regard it as one of Virgil's experiments in a new style (p. 156, n. 4). The three *Priapea* and the *Copa* are recognized as genuine, and are assigned to a period between the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*.

The question of the authenticity of these Minor Poems was brought home to me very intimately when I was engaged on the *Virgil* for the Loeb Classical Library. I had completed the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* before taking up the lesser works, and naturally, while laboring over the Appendix, I was confronted at almost every step with the problem whether I was dealing with Virgilian or non-Virgilian matter. In the case of many writers, a difference in subject or style would be sufficient to settle the question of spuriousness or genuineness, but in the present case a change of subject or of *genre*



may account for a change of style, and the undoubtedly genuine works of Virgil exhibit a great variety of both subject and style. The *Eclogues* are classified as pastorals, but they embrace a variety of topics, and their style runs the gamut from the naïveté of colloquial speech to the sublimity of the epic. So with the *Georgics*. These are didactic poems on a technical subject, but they have a light as well as a weighty side, and deal with simple folk lore as well as advanced science. They reflect the tone of rustic Colin Clout and the skilled astronomer; of the plain man *deos qui novit agrestis*, and the learned philosopher *qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*; of the lyrist and the satirist; of the writer of mock heroics and the serious singer on epic themes. As for the *Aeneid*, it is the most comprehensive poem in Latin literature, and embraces passages of graceful humor as well as of tragic earnestness. One book deals with the passion of love, and another with the immortality of the soul. In such a work we have a great variety of styles.

A more definitive test of authenticity is furnished by metrical technique. Several scholars have made elaborate analyses of the metrical characteristics of the *Culex*, *Ciris*, *Aetna*, and other poems and have arrived at interesting results. Thus Butcher's study of "The Caesura in Virgil," *Class. Quart.* VIII (1914), leads him to the conclusion that the *Culex* and the *Moretum* are probably genuine, while the other hexameter poems are not (p. 128). In the *Aetna* trochaic caesura occurs in 15% of the lines, an increase on Virgil, which betokens a later date (p. 128). As to the *Ciris*, its characteristics are against its authenticity.

Nearly akin to metrical tests is one that Drachmann applied to some of the poems in question. In his article on the "Cirisfrage" in *Herm.* XLIII, 405 ff. he notes the cases where the end of the verse and the end of a sentence or clause coincide, and he finds that in this respect there is a descending proportion, as you pass from the *Aratea* of Cicero through Catullus and Lucretius to the *Aeneid* of Virgil. The pro-

portion for Cicero (and Catullus and Lucretius are practically the same) is slightly over 50%, but for the *Georgics* it is 34.8, and for the *Aeneid* only 27.7. The *Ciris* has a higher percentage than Cicero, being 51.3, while the *Culex* has 41.3. Thus it is evident that in this respect "the *Ciris* is associated with the poetry of the Ciceronian age, while the *Culex* comes between that poetry and Virgil" (Hardie, "A Criticism of Criteria," *Class. Quart.* x [1916], 47). The *Moretum* falls between the *Ciris* and the *Culex* with a proportion of 47.2, but the *Panegyric on Messalla* is completely out of the reckoning, showing the extraordinary proportion of 68.4.

Other tests have been employed by Hardie, who has examined the poems under discussion according to the use of certain mannerisms, such as the employment of participles in the nominative singular, or the mode followed by some writers of "talking about their own literary efforts or purposes." On the basis of such tests Hardie is inclined to reject all these larger poems, even the *Culex*, and to deny them Virgilian authorship.

The most important criterion, and the one which, it seems to me, should be the most fundamental, has not yet been employed to any great extent in connection with this important question. This is the criterion furnished by vocabulary.

No writer of course confines himself absolutely to the same range of vocabulary from first to last in a long career, but on the other hand no writer, when dealing with similar subjects, is likely to use a vocabulary in his earlier work which he largely discards in his later. His range may expand considerably, but it will not also contract to any great extent. Indeed, we should not be surprised if at times an author adopts unusual words more freely in his later than in his earlier work, even if he is dealing with the same subject throughout. Even in the last book of the *Aeneid* Virgil uses 88 words found nowhere else in his writings.

The *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid* embrace nearly 13,000 hexameters (12,914, to be exact). This makes a very large

body of genuine Virgilian verse with which we may compare the questionable poems, and it so happens that, for the most part, the debatable material is of the same metrical structure and belongs to the same literary types as the poems in the unquestioned Virgilian Corpus. Thus the *Culex* and the *Ciris* are epics and belong to the same genus as the *Aeneid*; the *Aetna* is a didactic poem, which belongs to the same class as the *Georgics*, and involves the descriptive handling of a scientific theme. The *Dirae* and *Lydia* are distinctly pastoral in character, and the *Moretum* may also be regarded as a bucolic idyll, though in its design and treatment it reminds one of certain passages in the *Georgics* rather than in the *Eclogues*. These six poems embrace 1905 hexameters. The *Copa*, *Priapea*, and *Catalepton* are more miscellaneous in character, include only 314 verses, and are in type farthest removed from the great Virgilian works.

It will thus appear that, so far as most of the doubtful poems are concerned, we should not expect to find them, if genuine, differing greatly in their vocabulary from the major poems. Certainly they should not exhibit a greater number of ἀπαξ λεγόμενα, especially if they are *early* works of Virgil. But if we discover that their proportion of unusual words is abnormally large, then we shall logically and inevitably decide against the Virgilian authorship.

Let us take the *Aetna* first. Here we have a very unpromising subject, which is treated in most unsuccessful fashion, the style being so stilted, prosaic, and artificial that, if a plebiscite could be taken to determine the views of Latin scholars who had read the poem, I suppose that at least 95 % of them would unhesitatingly express their conviction that the writer, whoever he was, was certainly not Virgil. For my part I agree with Munro that the style is more like Lucan than Virgil, but even so I should not care to contest Professor Rand's view on merely subjective grounds alone. It is in vocabulary also that I find corroborative evidence that the *Aetna* is not by Virgil.

In making comparisons, I will as a rule exclude from discussion the proper names and adjectives used, though even here there may be good reason for admitting them occasionally into discussion. Thus among the 17 proper nouns and adjectives in the *Aetna*, we have un-Virgilian forms in *Pierius* (7), and *Pergamon* (18, 589), for Virgil uses only *Pierides*<sup>3</sup> and *Pergama*. Virgil seems to avoid *Gigantes*, which occurs three times in the *Aetna* (cf. *Geor.* I, 280; *Aen.* VI, 582).

The writer of the *Aetna* uses, of course, a certain amount of technical vocabulary, like *alumen* (389), *seminium* (539), and *siphon* (326), but most of his strange words stand for quite familiar concepts. They are simply un-Virgilian, often prosaic rather than poetic, and sometimes characteristic either of comedy, which is early Latin, or of the Silver period, which is late.

In the 644 verses of the *Aetna*, there are 151 words not found in Virgil's authentic works. Of these 17 are proper names or adjectives, leaving a remainder of 134. This presents a non-Virgilian element of 20.8 %, that is, 20.8 non-Virgilian words in 100 lines. Of these 134 the poet with whom the largest number can be associated is Ovid, for as many as 72 of them are found in Ovid's works. In other words the *Aetna* is more Ovidian than Virgilian in its vocabulary. I have used Ellis' index to the *Aetna* and Burman's index, appended to the fourth volume of his Amsterdam edition of Ovid (1727), which Radford quite rightly describes as "much neglected." <sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Ovid uses both *Pierus* and *Pierides*.

<sup>4</sup> Now that I have reached the constructive part of my argument, let me say that it had been practically completed before the *Transactions* of this Association for either 1920 or 1921 came into my hands. Had I even known that Professor Radford was working on the problem of the Appendix and had advanced as far as the conclusion which he reaches in his paper on "The Juvenile Works of Ovid and the Spondaic Period of His Metrical Art," *T.A.P.A.* LI (1920), I should hardly have had the temerity to send the title of this contribution to our Secretary; and I should have been even less inclined to submit it, had I seen Radford's article on "The Priapea and the Vergilian Appendix" which has just appeared in the *T.A.P.A.* for 1921. As it is, however, I must frankly

The proportion of non-Virgilian words in the *Aetna* is not as high as one would expect in view of the un-Virgilian style, yet the vocabulary is remarkable for including a great many common words which Virgil altogether avoids, while other poets, such as Ovid and the Elegists, use them freely. It is remarkable, for instance, that a word like *libellus* should nowhere appear in Virgil, but should be found in Ovid 53 times, and that the form *materia*, which Virgil never uses, while *materies* occurs but once (*Aen.* XI, 328), should be found in the *Aetna* 5 times, and 44 times in Ovid. Other striking examples are furnished by *alimentum*, *arbitrium*, *lyra*, *minimus*, *minuo*, *moderor*, and *tabella*. Here is the complete list of non-Virgilian words: <sup>5</sup>

*Aetna*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| *adfinis 252 (Plaut., Ter., Luc.)             | apluda 354 (Naev.)                                     |
| adiuto 435, 489 (Plaut., Ter., Lucr.)         | *arbitrium <sup>8</sup> 195 (Lucr., Hor., Prop., Tib.) |
| *adsumo <sup>6</sup> 159 (Lucr., Hor., Prop.) | brutus 409 (Lucr., Hor.)                               |
| *adtineo 348 (Lucr., Hor.)                    | calleo 263 (Lucr., Hor.)                               |
| agedum 550 (Lucr., Prop.)                     | *carbo 411 (Lucr. Hor.),                               |
| *alimentum <sup>7</sup> 159, 385 (Prop.)      | cernulo 493 (conject. for cernulus, late Lat.)         |
| *alumen 389 (reading of Heinsius)             | *coacervatus 50 (Cat.)                                 |

admit that, so far as my observations go, they lend support to Radford's view that there is little, if any, material in the Appendix that should be regarded as Virgilian. I will not say, however, that I am prepared to follow Radford quite as far as the goal to which he would lead us, namely, that these poems are the work of the youthful Ovid. His articles, however, deserve very careful study, and I am delighted to find one American critic who refuses to listen to the voice of the charmer Vollmer, to whom too many of our Virgilian scholars have so readily succumbed. "Vollmer's method" says Radford (*T.A.P.A.* LII [1921], 164) "appears to me wholly to lack the critical faculty, and his article, in its total rejection of internal evidence and its almost total neglect of the work of nearly all students of the Appendix, seems a most remarkable production to proceed from a learned scholar of the twentieth century."

<sup>5</sup> In the following lists I have marked with an asterisk the words that are found in Ovid, while attention is commonly called in parenthesis to other poets who have used the words, and come nearest in date to Virgil.

<sup>6</sup> In Ovid 12 times.      <sup>7</sup> In Ovid 27 times in plural.      <sup>8</sup> In Ovid 25 times.

- commeo 100 (Plaut., Ter.)  
 commurmuro 299  
 \*concordia 287 (Lucr., Hor., Prop.)  
 concremo 622 (Sen.)  
 confluvium 121, 326  
 \*congeries 206, 374, 478  
 conrogo 370  
 conservo 524 (Lucr., Prop.)  
 constringo 516 (Hor., Prop.)  
 \*corrigo<sup>9</sup> 182 (Hor.)  
 \*crucio<sup>10</sup> 268 (Hor., Prop.)  
 cunctanter 413  
 declinis 345 (Lucr., Stat.)  
 \*decreco 471 (Lucr., Hor.)  
 dein 515 (Hor., Prop.)  
 demonstro 462 (Cat., Prop., Tib.)  
 dequeror 585 (Val. Fl., Stat.)  
 \*dissipo 501 (Lucr., Hor.)  
 \*dolum 269 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  
 \*durities 516 (Lucr., Cat.)  
 effumo 499  
 \*eheu 627 (Hor., Prop.)  
 elanguesco 427 (Val. Fl.)  
 emergo 118 (Cat., Lucr.)  
 emugio 294  
 \*exagito 154, 209, 318 (Prop.)  
 excandesco 604  
 exilis 98 (Lucr., Hor., Prop.)  
 \*existo<sup>11</sup> 300  
 exundo 382 (Stat., Sil.)  
 faber 197 (Hor., Tib.)  
 \*fabula<sup>12</sup> 23, 42, 510, 602 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  
 \*faex 475 (Lucr., Hor.)  
 figulus 515 (Juv.)  
 \*flebilis<sup>13</sup> 588 (Hor., Tib.)  
 \*foramen<sup>14</sup> 285, 565  
 fulguro 607 (Stat., Sil.)  
 \*fusilis 532, 535  
 \*inaequalis 491 (Hor., Mart., Juv.)  
 incompertus 142, 546  
 \*incurso 56, 352 (Plaut.)  
 \*index<sup>15</sup> 245 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  
 \*inertia 53 (Hor., Tib.)  
 infimus 104  
 \*infior 528 (Plaut., Mart., Juv.)  
 inopinatus 127  
 introitus 282 (Juv.)  
 \*introrsus 107, 176, 288 (Hor.)  
 introspectus 340  
 lentities 542  
 levitas 349, 526 (Lucr., Prop.)  
 \*libellus<sup>16</sup> 536 (Prop.)  
 \*licentia 74 (Plaut., Ter.)  
 \*lyra<sup>17</sup> 575 (Prop., Tib.)  
 \*magnificus 567 (Tib.)  
 \*materia<sup>18</sup> 392, 425, 445, 455, 511  
 mendico 370 (Plaut., Juv.)  
 \*mendosus 74  
 \*meo 232  
 \*milito 217 (Prop., Hor.)  
 \*minimus<sup>19</sup> 617 (Hor.)  
 \*minuo<sup>20</sup> 282 (Lucr., Hor., Prop.)

<sup>9</sup> In Ovid 11 times.<sup>10</sup> In Ovid 9 times.<sup>11</sup> In Ovid 11 times.<sup>12</sup> In Ovid 17 times.<sup>13</sup> In Ovid 23 times.<sup>14</sup> In Ovid 9 times.<sup>15</sup> In Ovid 22 times.<sup>16</sup> In Ovid 53 times.<sup>17</sup> In Ovid 46 times.<sup>18</sup> In Ovid 44 times.<sup>19</sup> In Ovid 31 times.<sup>20</sup> In Ovid 22 times.

- \*moderor<sup>21</sup> 557  
 momen 304 (Lucr.)
- \*nubilus (sing.) 288, 312 (Prop., Tib.)
- \*numerosus, 38, 296 (Prop.)
- \*obrepo, 239 (Tib.)
- \*obsequor 337 (Juv.)
- \*occursus 376
- \*operosus<sup>22</sup> 567 (Hor., Prop.)
- parsurus (parco) 622, 623  
 patientia 409 (Tib.)
- \*perbibo 320 (Plaut.)  
 perhaurio 420 (Plaut.)  
 perpascor 491
- \*perquiro 254 (Plaut.)  
 persaepe 508 (Hor., Prop.)  
 pertabesco 474
- \*pessum 137 (Plaut., Ter., Lucr.)
- \*petulans 73 (Juv.)  
 pigre 413 (Lucr.)
- \*ploro 586 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)
- \*praeclusus (Lucr., Prop.)
- \*professus 260
- \*promptus (subst.) 160, 218 (Plaut., Lucr.)  
 prope (adv.) 213 (Prop., Tib.)  
 proprietas 512  
 proruo 308 (Hor.)
- \*provoco 52, 53 (Tib.)
- \*pugnax 242 (Hor., Prop.)
- \*raro 436 (Hor., Prop.)
- \*refrigesco 439 (Lucr.)
- \*rotundus 433 (Lucr., Hor., Prop.)
- scateo 431, 456 (Lucr., Hor.)
- \*scrutor 178, 257 (Lucr., Hor.)  
 seminium 539 (Lucr.)
- \*senesco 238 (Lucr.)
- \*sepono 642 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  
 simans (conject.) 494  
 siphon 326 (Juv.)
- \*spatiosus<sup>23</sup> 140 (Prop.)
- \*stolidus<sup>24</sup> 365 (Lucr., Hor., Prop.)
- \*subsequor 221 (Tib.)
- \*subtilis 144 (Lucr., Hor.)
- \*subverto 543 (Lucr., Hor.)  
 succerno 495 (Plaut.)
- \*succurro 194 (Lucr., Plaut., Tib.)  
 sucosus 267, 533  
 suffoco 319 (Lucr.)
- \*tabella<sup>25</sup> 592 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  
 transfugio 348 (Plaut.)
- utpote 491 (Plaut., Hor.)
- vacuo (-are) 107 (Lucr.)  
 varie 184, 396 (Plaut.)  
 vegeo 120 (ante-class.)
- \*ventilo 350 (Prop.)
- \*verax 174 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  
 vernaculus 386 (Plaut.)  
 viceni 508  
 vixdum 611 (Ter.)

<sup>21</sup> In Ovid 19 times, besides *moderate* and *moderatus*.

<sup>22</sup> In Ovid 11 times.

<sup>24</sup> In Ovid 9 times.

<sup>23</sup> In Ovid 19 times.

<sup>25</sup> In Ovid 44 times.

Turning next to the *Culex*,<sup>26</sup> which all critics are much more inclined to attribute to Virgil than the *Aetna*, it is surprising to find that this poem has a slightly larger proportion of alien vocabulary than the *Aetna*, for in its 414 verses we find 134 non-Virgilian words, 45 of which are proper names. The remaining 89 show a foreign element amounting to 21.25 in a hundred lines. Of these as many as 58 are found in Ovid, so that only 31 are non-Ovidian. It is to be observed that certain of the *Culex* adjectives foreign to Virgil are great favorites with Ovid. Thus *vagus* and *viduus* each occur 18 times in his works,<sup>27</sup> *senilis* 12 times, *squalidus* 11 times, *invidus* 10 times, *luridus* 8 times, *parilis* and *pudibundus* each 7 times, *excelsus* 5 times, *floridus* and *truculentus* each 4 times. Among nouns, *lyra* occurs 48 times, *iocus* 26 times, *baculum* 15 times, *charta* and *convicium* 14 times each, *nitor* 13 times, *notitia* and *utilitas* 12 times, *languor* 11 times, *perfidia* 6 times, and *historia* 5 times. Of verbs, *resideo* occurs 21 times, *aversor* 7 times, *polleo* and *remoror* 6 times, *propello* 5 times, and *refoveo* 4 times. Of other parts of speech, we find *quilibet* 22 times, *leniter* 7 times, and *eheu* 4 times. Of the proper nouns and adjectives found in the *Culex*, it may be worth while to observe that Virgil never employs *Pierius* (vs. 18), *Giganteus* (28), *Erichthonius*<sup>28</sup> (adj., 30, 336, 344), *Hyperion* (101), *Nyctelius* (111), *Cadmeis* (111), *Cadmeus* (254), *Erebous* (202), *Hymen* (247), *Bistonius* (252), *Zanclaeus* (332), *Sparticus* (400), *Cilix* (401), *Cupidineus* (409). Of these words, *Giganteus* occurs in Ovid 5 times, *Hyperion* 6 times, *Bistonius* 8 times, and *Hymen* 9 times. Of the remainder, the majority

<sup>26</sup> In dealing with the remaining poems of the Appendix, we have the great advantage of being able to use the excellent *Index Vergilianus* of Professor Wetmore's (Yale University Press, 1911).

<sup>27</sup> Ovid's works embrace 32,285 verses, somewhat more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times as many as Virgil's.

<sup>28</sup> Commenting on *Erichthonias arces* (336) Leo says: "bellam deprendimus doctrinae ostentationem; idem scilicet qui v. 30 *Erichthonias arces* Athenas nominavit, hic Troiam ab Erichthonio Dardani filio, quem ex Iliadis v.319 omnes norunt, adiectivum praeter hunc nemo, ac statim repetit v. 344."



occur in Ovid, though less seldom, 27 of the non-Virgilian names appearing in his works.

The *Culex* sometimes shows inflectional forms unknown to Virgil. Thus *Panes* (94, 115) and *neces* (310); Virgil uses only the singular in each case. Also *labruscum* (55), as compared with *labrusca* (1st decl.) in Virgil; and *meto* (174), for which Virgil always gives the deponent *metor*. The *Culex*, like the *Aetna*, has *Pierius* (18); Virgil uses *Pierides*. The word *luxuria* is used twice in the *Georgics* (I, 112. 191) in the sense of 'richness of crop,' but in the *Culex* it means 'rich living.' The latter is the only sense in which it is used by Propertius, but both meanings are common in Ovid. The verb *formo* is found only twice in all Virgil, but four times in the *Culex* (2, 396, 397, 412), and twelve times in Ovid. Certain other words, fairly characteristic of the *Culex*, being used at least twice, are rare in Virgil. Thus:

*officium* (223, 231, 414), only in *Aen.* I, 548. It is a *verbum amatorium*<sup>29</sup> and occurs 6 times in Propertius, and 91 times in Ovid. *evectus* (84, 107, 253), never in Virgil, though *evēhit* occurs once.

The participle is found twice in Ovid.

*distans* (232, 259). Only *distant* in Virgil. The participle occurs 11 times in Ovid.

*feritas* (303, 311), only in *Aen.* XI, 568, but 13 times in Ovid.

*liquor* (14, 149, 307), only in *Geor.* III, 488, but 6 times in Ovid.

*excelsus* (46, 155), only as a variant in *Aen.* V, 35, but 5 times in Ovid.

*adsideo* (301, 335), only in *Aen.* XI, 304, but 4 times in Ovid.

*corymbus* (144, 405), only in *Ecl.* III, 39. Used by Ovid.

*rapax* (103, 331), only in *Geor.* III, 142. Used by Propertius and Tibullus.

The following is a list of non-Virgilian words in this poem:

#### *Culex*

\**amaranthus* 406 (Tib.)

\**baculum* 98 (Prop.)

*araneolus* 2

*bocchus* 406

*aureolus* 144 (Plaut., Cat.)

\**aversor* 256

\**charta* 24 (Tib.)

<sup>29</sup> Pichon, *De sermone amatorio*, Paris, 1902.

- chrysanthus 405  
 \*comparo 178 (Tib.)  
 \*compos 191 (Tib.)  
   concheus 68  
   conformo 391 (Cat.)  
 \*conscelero 375  
 \*convicium 209 (Prop.)  
 \*cubo 154 (Prop., Tib.)  
   culex 3, 7, 208, 387, 413 (Lucr., Hor.)  
  
   discordo 254 (Hor.)  
   dissero 188 (Lucr.)  
   distinguo 71 (Hor.)  
 \*dito 343 (Tib.)  
 \*doctrina 5  
  
 \*echo 152  
 \*eheu 258' (Prop.)  
   elogium 412 (Plaut.)  
 \*epops 253  
   escendo 143 (Plaut.)  
 \*excelsus 46, 155 (Tib.)  
   excessus 302  
 \*exorabilis 288 (Prop.)  
  
   fautor 13 (Hor.)  
 \*floridus 70 (Tib.)  
  
 \*gemmans 70  
   generamen 334  
  
 \*herois 261 (Prop.)  
 \*historia 4  
  
 \*impietas 249  
 \*inertia 385 (Tib.)  
   inevectus 101, 341  
 \*invidus 5  
 \*inviolatus 263  
 \*iocus 6  
  
   labruscum 53  
   lamentor 132  
 \*languor 198 (Hor.)  
 \*leto 325  
 \*leniter 155 (Tib.)  
 \*luridus 47 (Prop., Tib.)  
 \*lyra 13, 285  
  
   nectareus 241  
   nitor 63, 348, 405  
   notitia 5  
  
 \*obstrepo 150 (Prop., Tib.)  
   obtero 188 (Plaut.)  
   occaeco 199 (post-Aug.)  
   orsus 2  
  
 \*parilis 229, 358  
 \*pendulus 52  
 \*perfidia 132 (Prop.)  
 \*polleo 74 (Prop.)  
   praepando 16 (Lucr.)  
 \*propello 45  
   prosterno 69, 336  
 \*pudibundus 399  
 \*pupula 186  
  
 \*quantumcunque 388  
   quaqua 150 (post-class.)  
 \*quilibet 92 (Prop.)  
  
   recino 13, 72 (Hor.)  
 \*refoveo 122, 213  
   regemo 386 (Stat.)  
 \*remoror 119 (Prop., Tib.)  
 \*resideo 106, 109, 146, 358  
   (Prop.)  
 \*respectus 228, 269  
 \*revolubilis 169 (Prop.)  
   rhododaphne 402

|                           |                           |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| *senilis 388              | *tribuo 388 (Prop., Tib.) |
| sparsim 346 (post-class.) | *truculentus 255          |
| *squalidus 333            | *utilitas 66              |
| *tentus 130               | *vagus 23                 |
| timefactus 366 (Lucr.)    | *vecors 249               |
| toreuma 67                | *verno 410 (Prop.)        |
| transcendo 84 (Prop.)     | *viduus 373 (Prop.)       |

Most scholars have found it easier to come to a decision upon the authorship of the *Ciris* than upon that of the *Culex*. The external evidence is much weaker, and even Rand admits that "at the first reading the *Ciris* seems curiously unlike Virgil" (p. 146). He would assign the poem to Virgil's twenty-first year. Frank would place it two or three years later. Vollmer thinks that the introduction, which may be later than the body of the poem, was written in 27 B.C., after Messalla's victory over the Aquitanians.

In the 541 verses of the *Ciris* there are, I find, 131 words not to be met in Virgil. Of these, 51 are proper names, and it is significant that as many as 38 of the 51 appear in Ovid. Among them are *Giganteus* (30), and *Pandionius*, (101, 408), both of which we found in the *Culex* as well. The common words unknown to Virgil are present in the proportion of 14.8 to 100 verses. Many of these seem to be favorites with the writer, one of them, *alumna*, being used 11 times. *Haliae-etos*, *ocellus*, and *sophia* are used three times each, while the following occur twice each: *charta*, *complures*, *despuo*, *frigidulus*, *libido*, *mirificus*, *nutricula*, *polleo*, *pote*, *remoror*, *tabesco*, *tribuo*. Note the form *pote* (= *potest*), the archaic infinitive *vexarier*, and the curious use of *terrarum milia* for *terrarum orbis* (521).

Many of the non-Virgilian words in the *Ciris* are much in evidence in Ovid, as may be seen from the following instances. Thus *ocellus*, 20 times; *relevo* and *tribuo*, 19 times each; *leviter*, *sedulus*, *supprimo*, 16 times each; *charta*, 14 times; *libido*, 13 times; *infamis* and *mendacium*, 9 times each; *marita*,

*tumulo*, *unicus*, 8 times each; *polleo* and *remoror*, 6 times each; *salutifer*, 4 times; *alumna*, 3 times. Of proper names, *Homerus* occurs in Ovid 9 times, *Athenae* 7 times, and *Atticus*, *Echidna* and *Giganteus*, 5 times each.

The complete list, exclusive of proper names, is as follows:

*Ciris*

- |  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| adsigno 304 (Tib.)                         | *haliaeetus 204, 528, 536     |
| aegrotus 226 (Hor.)                        | hortulus 3 (Cat.)             |
| aerumna 58 (Hor.)                          | imprudencia 190 (Ter.)        |
| *alumna 224, 246, 274, 289,                | *infamis 87 (Prop., Tib.)     |
| 311, 324, 331, 338, 347, 381,              | *infestare 57                 |
| 441  | *internodium 491              |
| ancillaris 443                             | interverto 84 (Plaut.)        |
| *animans 491                               |                               |
| *antistita 166                             | *lascivio 142                 |
| argute (conject.) 186 (Plaut.)             | *lectulus 440 (Prop.)         |
|  | *leviter 11 (Prop.)           |
| *charta 39, 62 (Tib.); also in <i>Cul.</i> | *libido 13 (Prop.)            |
| *chorda 178 (Tib.)                         | livesco 450 (Lucr.)           |
| circumvehor 271 (Plaut.)                   |                               |
| coccina 169 (Mart.)                        | *macero 244                   |
| coccum 31 (Hor.)                           | *marceo (conject.) 347        |
| complures 54, 391 (Hor.)                   | *marita 443 (Prop.)           |
| concrebro 25                               | *mendacium 362 (Prop.)        |
| confinco 362 (Ter.)                        | *meretrix 86 (Prop.)          |
| conquiro 354 (Prop.)                       | mirificus 12, 13 (Ter.)       |
| consaepio (conject.) 85                    |                               |
| crobylus (conject.) 128                    | nicto 218 (Lucr.)             |
| crocota 252 (Plaut.)                       | notesco 90 (Prop.)            |
| *curalium 434                              | *novenus 371                  |
|  | nutricula 257, 277 (Hor.)     |
| *denubo 330                                |                               |
| despuo 372, 373 (Tib.)                     | obnix 301 (Ter.)              |
| *detondeo 186 (Prop.)                      | *ocellus 132, 238, 345 (Cat.) |
| deturpo 284                                |                               |
|  | *pertimesco 82 (Tib.)         |
| exorno 148 (Prop., conject.)               | polleo 411, 483 (Prop.); also |
| *expallesco 81 (Hor.)                      | in <i>Cul.</i>                |
| frigidulus 251, 348 (Cat.)                 | *populator 111                |
|  | pote 227, 328 (Prop.)         |

- |                                  |                                |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| praes 321                        | *sedulus 354 (Prop., Tib.)     |
| primitus 490 (Cat.)              | senium 249 (Plaut., Ter.)      |
| psalterium 178                   | sophia 4, 12, 40 (Enn., Mart.) |
|                                  | storax 168                     |
| *quaestus 78                     | *supprimo 404 (Prop.)          |
| querimonia 462 (Hor.)            |                                |
| *quinquennia 24 (Hor.)           | *tabesco 249, 450 (Prop.)      |
|                                  | tabidulus 182                  |
| recrepo 108 (Cat.)               | thallus 376                    |
| *relevo 340 (Prop.)              | *tribuo 93, 270 (Prop., Tib.); |
| *remoror 217, 236 (Prop., Tib.); | also in <i>Cul.</i>            |
| also in <i>Cul.</i>              | *tumulo 442                    |
| *repentinus 460                  |                                |
|                                  | *unicus 334 (Prop.)            |
| *salutifer 477                   |                                |
| sapientia 14 (Hor.)              | *vorax 57                      |

In the above list of 80 words, half the number (39, to be exact) are found in Ovid, and though many of the words are used by other poets as well, none of these approach Ovid in respect to frequency of occurrence. The *Ciris* indeed, like the *Aetna* and the *Culex*, is distinctly more Ovidian than Virgilian in its vocabulary.

We have seen that while Rand rejects the *Moretum* for lack of external evidence, and Frank is inclined to accept it, Butcher thinks it is probably genuine, and Drachmann places it in time between the *Ciris* and the *Culex*. What is the evidence furnished by vocabulary? In the 124 hexameters of the *Moretum*, there are 69 non-Virgilian words, only two of which are proper names. The poem abounds, of course, in agricultural and botanical terms, but both the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* offer a similar field for such language. Of the non-Virgilian words as many as 31 are found in Ovid, and 22 in Horace. We may note too that some of these words are remarkably common in Ovid, for *tabella* occurs 44 times, *remaneo* and *spatiosus* 19 times each, *leviter* and *sedulus* 16 times each, *convicium* 14 times, *mensura* 13 times, *foramen* 9 times, *sincerus* 7 times, *providus* and *mica* each 5 times. So far then as vocabulary goes, the *Moretum* is far more Ovidian than

Virgilian, though even so there remains a larger non-Ovidian element than in any of the poems previously considered. The complete list of non-Virgilian words is as follows :

*Moretum*

- |                                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| acetum 114 (Hor.)                 | *liquo 42 (Hor.)                             |
| *acumen 77 (Hor.)                 | loratus 123                                  |
| beta 72 (Cat., Mart.)             | *lucerna 10 (Hor., Tib.)                     |
| *bulbus 96                        | macellum 83 (Hor.)                           |
| *caepa 84 (Hor.)                  | *malva 73 (Mart.)                            |
| calcaneum 36                      | *mensura 17 (Juv.)                           |
| carnarium 56 (Plaut., Mart.)      | *mica 98 (Hor.)                              |
| casula 61, 67 (Juv.)              | *moretum 118                                 |
| *clavis 15 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)    | mortarium 93, 116 (Plaut.)                   |
| *convicium 110 ( <i>Cul.</i> 209) | mundo 50 (post-Aug.)                         |
| coriandrum 91 (Plaut.)            | nasturtium 85                                |
| *cribrum 40 (Pers.)               | *nocuus 75                                   |
| cucurbita 78 (Juv.)               | *nodosus 94                                  |
| *deperdo 104 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  | *octoni 18                                   |
| *dilato 48                        | panis 119 (Hor.)                             |
| emundo 43                         | perverro 23                                  |
| eruca 86 (Hor.)                   | pistillum 101, 112 (Plaut.)                  |
| excubitor 2                       | porrum 74, 84 (Mart., Juv.)                  |
| *excurro 18                       | *providus 60 (Hor., Tib.)                    |
| *exilis 35 (Hor., Prop.)          | *purgamen 41 (Prud.)                         |
| farina 40, 45 (Mart.)             | redivivus 62 (Prud.)                         |
| *foramen 42 (Hor.)                | refodio 88 (Luc.)                            |
| grabatus 5 (Cat.)                 | regula ( <i>al.</i> recula) 66 (Hor., Mart.) |
| grumus 47                         | *remaneo 8, 41 (Lucr., Hor.)                 |
| inspergo 98 (Hor.)                | rumex 73 (Plaut.)                            |
| instillo 113 (Hor.)               | *ruta 90                                     |
| inula 73 (Hor.)                   | salebrosus 111 (Mart.)                       |
| lactuca 76 (Mart.)                | *sedulus 119 ( <i>Cir.</i> 354)              |
| *leviter 88 ( <i>Cir.</i> 11)     | *sensim 5 (Plaut., Lucil.)                   |
|                                   | *sincerus 42 (Hor.)                          |

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| siser 74                               | transverso 46                 |
| spartum 58                             |                               |
| *spatiosus 35 (Luc.; adverb,<br>Prop.) | *unicus 31 ( <i>Cir.</i> 334) |
|  | venalis 81 (Hor., Prop.)      |
| *tabella 19 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)        | versatilis 39 (Lucr.)         |

As to the *Copa*, which is assigned to Virgil by Servius and Charisius (both fourth-century writers), but is not included in the Donatus list, both Rand and Frank unhesitatingly call it a Virgilian poem. I admit that it is not unworthy of Virgil, but when I find in its 38 verses (19 elegiac couplets) as many as 29 words foreign to Virgil as we know him, I become convinced that we must look elsewhere for the author. There are four proper nouns or adjectives in our list. Deduct these and the remainder is equivalent to the extraordinary proportion of 65.8 in one hundred verses. Only ten of the *Copa*'s non-Virgilian words are found in Ovid. The residuum belongs mainly to prose, comedy, and satire. The following is the complete list :

### *Copa*

|                                |                                 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| *asinus 26                     | *iunceus 17                     |
| *autumnalis 18 (Prop.)         | kalybae 7                       |
| caseolus 17                    | *lacerta 28 (Hor.)              |
| *chorda 7 ( <i>Cir.</i> 178)   | mitella 1                       |
| copa 1                         | pico 11 (Mart.)                 |
| corolla 13 (Cat., Prop.)       | strophium 32 (Cat., Prud.)      |
| crispus 2 (Juv.)               |                                 |
| crotalum 2                     | *taberna 3 (Hor., Prop.)        |
| crystallus 30 (Prop., Mart.)   | *talus 37 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)   |
| *cyathus 7 (Hor., Prop., Juv.) | topia 7                         |
| decumbo 6 (Sen.)               | trichila 8                      |
| *ebrius 3 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)  | vappa 11 (Hor., Mart.)          |
| garrio 9 (Hor.)                | *vitrum 29 (Hor., Prop., Mart.) |

Much more Virgilian than any of the poems thus far considered, so far at least as vocabulary is concerned, are the *Dirae* and the *Lydia*, in whose 183 hexameters there are only 30 common words unknown to Virgil (16.3 to 100 verses). The question, therefore, of their authorship will be largely dependent on our verdict as to the rest of the poems. If they are by Virgil, so too must these be. Slightly more than one-half of the non-Virgilian words, 17 in all, are found in Ovid, one of whose favorites, *libellus*, occurs in his works 51 times; *ocellus* and *tribuo* are also characteristic of Ovid. The complete list follows:

*Dirae*

|                       |                                      |
|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| cogulo 74             | *libellus 26, 34 (Hor., Juv., Mart.) |
| *cyaneus 40           |                                      |
| cycneus 1             | *pertica 45 (Prop.)                  |
| emano 72 (Lucr.)      | piscor 80 (Hor.)                     |
| *emergo 57 (Juv.)     | *praetor 82 (Prop.)                  |
| emigro 101 (Plaut.)   | *repentinus 56 ( <i>Cir.</i> 460)    |
| *erro 70 (Hor., Tib.) | *spica 73 (Prop., Tib.)              |
|                       | sterilesco 9                         |
| gryllus 74            | transvolo 44 (Hor.)                  |
| *indemnatus 84 (Juv.) | *vernus 21 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)       |

*Lydia*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| *adrideo 5 (Hor.)                       | *ploro 36, 72 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)          |
| inspergo 46 (Hor.)                      | stipendium 13 (Hor.)                       |
| interpello 36 (Hor.)                    | *tabesco 22 ( <i>Cir.</i> 249, 450)        |
| *mendacium 63 (Prop., Juv.)             | *tribuo ( <i>Cul.</i> 388; <i>Cir.</i> 93) |
| *moechus 66 (Hor., Juv.)                | vaccula 29 (Cat.)                          |
| *ocellus 5 ( <i>Cir.</i> 132, 238, 348) | vitecula 12                                |

The three *Priapea* are regarded as Virgilian by Birt, who holds that they were written shortly before the *Bucolics*. In this he is followed by Rand. Frank, however, would assign them, as well as the *Copa*, to the period between the *Eclogues*



and the *Georgics*. If this were so, there should be little difference in diction between the *Priapea* and the *Eclogues*, since in tone and spirit, if not in metres, the two groups have so much in common. Yet in 46 verses we find as many as 20 words (a proportion of 43.5 in 100 verses) used nowhere in Virgil, besides certain forms which differ from Virgilian usage. Thus *expedit*,<sup>30</sup> 2, 17, used impersonally, whereas the verb is always personal in Virgil; *proin*, 2, 16, for the Virgilian *proinde*; and *tuor*, 2, 5 and 3, 4, a Lucretian form<sup>31</sup> used instead of *tueor*, which Virgil employs 58 times.<sup>32</sup> The full list follows:

*Priapea*

|   |  |
|---|--|
| agellulus 2, 3  | hortulus 2, 4; 3, 18 ( <i>Cir.</i> 3)          |
| barbatus 3, 16 ( <i>Cat.</i> , <i>Hor.</i> )          | *ligneus 1, 3 ( <i>Prop.</i> , <i>Tib.</i> )   |
| corolla 2, 6; 3, 10 ( <i>Cop.</i> 13)                 | mentula 2, 18. 21 ( <i>Cat.</i> )              |
| *crux 2, 18 ( <i>Hor.</i> , <i>Prop.</i> )            | pol ( <i>bis</i> ) 2, 19 ( <i>Hor.</i> )       |
| cucurbita 3, 13 ( <i>Mor.</i> 78)                     | proin 2, 16 ( <i>Ter.</i> )                    |
| delicatus 2, 10 ( <i>Cat.</i> )                       | *spica 1, 2 ( <i>Dir.</i> 73)                  |
| formitatus 3, 3                                       | sursum 2, 17 ( <i>Lucr.</i> , <i>Mart.</i> )   |
| gelata ( <i>Birt</i> ) 2, 9 ( <i>Mart.</i> ,<br>Juv.) | tuor 2, 5; 3, 4 ( <i>Lucr.</i> , <i>Cat.</i> ) |
|   | vaccula ( <i>Lyd.</i> 29)                      |
|   | vilicus 2, 19 ( <i>Hor.</i> )                  |
| hirculus 3, 16  | villula 2, 4; 3, 1                             |

As regards the fifteen *Epigrammata* which make up the *Catalepton* collection, it would be easy to convince oneself that some at least of these are by Virgil.<sup>33</sup> The fifteenth is

<sup>30</sup> Birt's comment is: "Das *expedit* ist gut rustikan und wird gern bei Cato und Columella, *de re rustica*, verwendet."

<sup>31</sup> Sommer, *De P.V.M. Catalepton*, p. 107.

<sup>32</sup> The form *tueor* is used once in the *Priapea*, 3, 18.

<sup>33</sup> In his striking article on "The *Priapea* and the Vergilian Appendix" (*T.A.P.A.* LII, 162 ff.) Radford presents the theory that these little poems are Virgilian 'impersonations,' similar in character to the 'impersonations' of Tibullus (*Tib.* iv, 13; ii, 3. 5). In both cases he supposes that Ovid was the actual author.

of course an editorial epilogue, but the fourteenth undoubtedly refers to the *Aeneid* as a poem begun and not yet completed. The seventh is addressed to Varius, presumably the well-known friend of Virgil's, and the eighth to Siro's villa, in which the poet and his father are finding refuge. The second is assigned to Virgil by Quintilian. Others are bright *jeux d'esprit*, which might well be the product of a brilliant versifier, but when we find that the two longest poems in the collection — the ninth, of 64 verses in elegiac couplets, and the thirteenth, of 20 iambic strophes, 40 verses in all, — are absolutely unworthy of a poet of lofty character, distinction, and nobility, we begin to suspect that the ancient editor, who regarded these poems as Virgilian *elementa*, was sadly lacking in critical judgment. The ninth, however, the *Panegyric on Messalla*, though condemned by its stilted and artificial style, as well as by the excessive coincidence of verse-close and sentence-close, which Drachmann observed, is not very un-Virgilian in diction, for aside from proper names, it contains only four words for which we look in vain in Virgil, namely, *deterreo* (11), *herois* (21), *cyaneus* (27), and *immoderatus* (45).

Yet here again, however Virgilian the language may be, it is even more strikingly Ovidian, for of the eleven words absent in Virgil, as many as nine occur in Ovid. These include the four words already cited, together with the five proper nouns, namely, *Pegasides* (1) (a synonym for *Musae*), and four names associated with myths often alluded to by Ovid — *Oenides* (6), *Cassiopea* (28), *Semele* (33), *Inachis* (33). Radford's theory that this poem is not only by Ovid, but, as belonging to 27 B.C., is the poet's earliest extant work, a product of his seventeenth year, is not unattractive, and is certainly much more plausible than the hypothesis that these feeble verses were composed by the greatest of Roman poets at a time when he had published the *Georgics* and was entering upon the *Aeneid*.

The thirteenth poem of the *Catalepton*, which we have al-

ready characterized in no uncertain terms, is absolutely un-Virgilian in diction, for in its 40 verses there occur as many as 24 common words which cannot be duplicated in Virgil. This is equivalent to the extraordinary proportion of 60 non-Virgilian words to 100 short lines. The vocabulary is scarcely more Ovidian than Virgilian, for only six of the alien words are found in Ovid, namely, *adscribo*, *improbo*, *incito*, *prostituo*, *stola*, and *turgidus*. Most of the peculiar language belongs to comedy, satire, and prose. Whether these abusive verses were written by Horace, as Némethy holds, or by Ovid, as Radford believes, or by some unknown writer, as I am inclined to think, they are certainly not by Virgil.

Taking the *Catalepton* poems as a whole, we find that in their 229 verses there are 81 non-Virgilian words, which yield a proportion of 35.3 in 100 verses. Omission of the proper names reduces this to a percentage of 28.8. The complete list follows :

*Catalepton*

- |   |                                    |
|---|------------------------------------|
| *adscribo 13, 34 (Hor.)                             | *dedico 10, 25 (Hor., Tib.)        |
| amator 2, 1 (Hor., Prop., Tib.)                     | *deterreo 9, 11 (Hor., Tib.)       |
| ampulla 5, 1 (Hor.)                                 | dispeream 4, 3; 7, 2 (Hor., Prop.) |
| *bidens 10, 9 ( <i>Cir.</i> 213)                    | *eburneus 10, 23                   |
| *callidus 14 a                                      | *elementum 15, 3 (Hor., Juv.)      |
| *charta 5, 13 ( <i>Cul.</i> 24; <i>Cir.</i> 39, 62) | fascinus 13, 20 (Hor.)             |
| cinaedus 13, 35 (Cat., Mart., Juv.)                 | ferior 13, 20 (Hor.)               |
| cisium 10, 3  | genuinus 13, 36 (Juv., Pers.)      |
| comatus 10, 10                                      | helluor 13, 11                     |
| compitalia 13, 27                                   | hernia 12, 8 (Plaut.)              |
| contubernium 13, 7                                  | herniosus 13, 39                   |
| culina 13, 27 (Hor., Juv.)                          | *herois 9, 21 ( <i>Cul.</i> 261)   |
| cyathus 11, 4 (Hor., Prop., Juv.)                   | *historia 11, 6 ( <i>Cul.</i> 4)   |
| *cycneus 9, 27 ( <i>Dir.</i> 1)                     | *immoderatus 9, 45 (Lucr.)         |
|   | *improbo 13, 9 (Hor.)              |

|                                  |                                  |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| impudicus 13, 9 (Mart.)          | putidus 6, 2; 12, 1 (Cat., Hor.) |
| *incito 13, 8 (Juv.)             |                                  |
| inedia 13, 40 (Plaut.)           | *quatenus 2, 2 (Hor.)            |
| lutosus 10, 12                   | raro 5, 14 (Hor.)                |
| min 2, 4                         | rhetor 2, 2; 5, 1                |
| *momentum 3, 10 (Hor.)           | rhoso (?) 5, 2                   |
| mula 10, 19                      | salivosus 13, 29                 |
| mulio 10, 2 (Juv.)               | *sarcina 10, 16                  |
| natio 5, 4 (Plaut.)              | savium 13, 32                    |
| natis 13, 14 (Hor., Mart., Juv.) | scholasticus 5, 4                |
| orbitosus 10, 17                 | semitalis 10, 20                 |
| pentex 13, 31 (Mart.)            | sphin 2, 4                       |
| parsimonia 13, 11                | *stola 13, 21 (Hor., Mart.)      |
| patrimonium 13, 11               | strigare 10, 19                  |
| pertineo 6, 5                    | *tabella 14, 5 ( <i>Mor.</i> 19) |
| πόθος 7, 2                       | tau 2, 4                         |
| *prostitutio 13, 7               | *turgidus 13, 40 (Hor.)          |
| pudenter 5, 14 (Hor.)            | usquequaque 6, 5 (Mart.)         |

I am well aware that mere statistics often furnish an easy mark for criticism, and Rand very properly heaps ridicule on the figures adduced by W. Schmidt, who tries to prove from a statistical study of the use of verbs and adjectives in the *Culex* that that poem is un-Virgilian. For my part I am quite ready to concede that a certain number of novelties of expression may be expected in any literary product, and the mere fact that some words not used elsewhere in a writer's works do occur in the one suspected does not furnish conclusive proof that the work in question is spurious. Such a fact, however, may provide corroborative evidence, and in the case of these poems of the Appendix it is not merely the alien vocabulary that we should take into account, but also the questions of style, literary type, phraseology, turns of thought, personal mannerisms, and metrical technique, to say nothing of the external evidence involved. But even if we confine our at-

tention to the question of vocabulary, is it not true that, while we may assume for every writer that he will employ new words and expressions when occasion demands them, there must be some margin of inventiveness beyond which in a succession of his works he is not likely to advance? If the new element is abnormally large, surely we are justified in basing upon it a suspicion of alien authorship. Is it possible, then, to find out what this margin was in the case of Virgil?

I have examined the *Bucolics* from this point of view and I find some interesting facts. If we had reason to suspect the authenticity of these ten poems, and were to subject them to such a test as we have applied to the poems of the Appendix, we should learn that in the *Eclogues*, which embrace 829 verses, there are 102 common words not found elsewhere in Virgil's work. This is equivalent to a proportion of 12.3 in a hundred verses, a figure which would be reduced to about 9 %, if we were to treat the Minor Poems as genuine, and were therefore to exclude from consideration all words found in them as well as in the *Eclogues*. If we were to subject the individual *Eclogues* to the same test, the proportion would run from only 5.5 % (*Ecl.* VIII) to 15 % (*Ecl.* II), to be reduced in the latter case to 8.2 %, if we treated the Minor Poems as genuine. The other *Eclogues* would run thus: I, 12 %; III, 12.6 %; IV, 11 %; V, 7.7 %; VI, 10.46 %; VII, 8.5 %; IX, 6 %; X, 11.7 %.

Let us compare these figures with those which we have already given for the several poems of the Virgilian Appendix. We have seen that in these the non-Virgilian element shows a percentage as follows: *Aetna*, 20.8; *Culex*, 21.25; *Ciris*, 14.8; *Moretum*, 54; *Copa*, 65.8; *Dirae* (and *Lydia*), 16.3; *Priapea*, 43.5; *Catalepton*, 28.8 (*Cat.* XIII, 60 %). These figures show at once that there is a great difference between the Minor Poems and the *Eclogues* in their relation to general Virgilian vocabulary. The only poems which approach the norm of the *Bucolics* are the *Ciris* and the *Dirae*, next to which after a considerable interval come the *Aetna* and the *Culex*.

Even the books of the *Georgics*, which, notwithstanding their imaginative beauty and artistic finish, are nevertheless poems on special, practical, and even highly technical subjects, reveal on examination the truth that their vocabulary is much nearer to the Virgilian norm than is that of the poems of the Appendix. The words peculiar to the several books number respectively: I, 77; II, 79; III, 87; IV, 72, showing the following ratio to 100 verses: I, 15; II, 14.6; III, 15.3; IV, 12.7. Of all the Minor Poems only the *Ciris* can show as low a proportion of peculiarities of vocabulary.<sup>34</sup>

The result of our examination of the vocabulary of the Minor Poems has been to confirm us in our conviction — a conviction based originally on purely stylistic considerations — that probably not a single one of these poems has been correctly assigned to Virgil. They stand condemned by internal evidence. If we turn to other fields of literature for parallels, we may say that we have no more right to call these poems Virgil's than we have to claim the last twelve verses as part of the Gospel of St. Mark,<sup>35</sup> or than we have to attribute the tragedy of *Titus Andronicus* to Shakespeare.<sup>36</sup>

<sup>34</sup> A similar test applied to the *Aeneid* results as follows: I, 48 = 6%; II, 54 = 6.7%; III, 57 = 7.9%; IV, 52 = 7.37%; V, 63 = 7.2%; VI, 91 = 10%; VII, 77 = 9.4%; VIII, 75 = 10.2%; IX, 55 = 6.7%; X, 77 = 8.48%; XI, 78 = 8.5%; XII, 88 = 9.2%.

<sup>35</sup> Speaking of these verses, as well as of the shorter duplicate passage found in four uncial manuscripts of the New Testament, Plummer says, in his edition of the Gospel in the *Cambridge Greek Testament*, p. XLIII: "That neither of these endings is part of the original Gospel is one of those sure results of modern criticism which ought no longer to need to be proved." And yet (p. XLV) Plummer himself admits that the "external evidence to the genuineness of the twelve verses seems to be not only conclusive, but superabundant." This external evidence, however, "is completely shattered by the internal evidence, which by itself would be decisive" (p. XLVII).

<sup>36</sup> See John M. Robertson, *Did Shakespeare Write "Titus Andronicus"?* (London, 1905): "The whole mass of the internal evidence is overwhelmingly against the traditionist view" (p. 238). Robertson's Epilogue might be studied by classical scholars with profit. He writes: "After a generation in which much was done to reach exactness of method and rationality of test, we seem to be in large part given over to the merest intuitionism." In these days of 'higher criticism' he claims that "the criticism of some developments of secular literature has reverted to pre-scientific forms."

The only reason left for claiming Virgil as the author of the Appendix rests upon external evidence, the testimony of Servius and Donatus. Yet how easy it was in ancient days for anonymous literary works to become attached to the names of famous authors! Thus the Cyclic epics and the *Hymns* were commonly assigned to Homer. Thus it was that numerous short but spurious poems, composed in the sententious style, fastened themselves upon Theognis. Thus pastoral poems, of unknown authorship, were readily assigned to Theocritus. Thus the Tibullan Corpus grew to its present dimensions. And thus too, I believe, in the early post-Augustan age, when Virgil's renown was at its height, a body of verse, comprising mock-heroics, epyllia, idylls, and epigrams, which came to light without any name attached, were conjectured to be the work of Virgil in his early years.

Apart from the *Eclogues*, *Georgics*, and *Aeneid*, I doubt whether a single line of genuine Virgilian work has survived. From what his biographers themselves say, we infer that Virgil must have taken the greatest pains to suppress his immature and imperfect productions. "Scripta sua sub ea conditione legavit ne quid ederent quod non a se editum esset." Even the *Aeneid* would never have survived except through an imperial decree: "edidit autem auctore Augusto Varius."